



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

J

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/950,026	09/10/2001	Manh Hung Pham	016295.0693	1709
7590	06/24/2005		EXAMINER	
Roger Fulghum Baker Botts L.L.P. One Shell Plaza 910 Louisiana Street Houston, TX 77002-4995				WILSON, YOLANDA L
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2113
DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/950,026	PHAM, MANH HUNG	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Yolanda Wilson	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### THIRD DETAILED ACTION

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,3,4,6-13,15-17,19,20,22-29,31,32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Raynham et al. (USPN 5774647A). As per claims 1 and 17, Raynham et al. discloses detecting a memory error; analyzing said memory error, determining a memory module in which said error occurred and creating a log; and storing said log in said non-volatile memory section of said memory module in column 10, lines 4-18 and the abstract.

3. As per claims 3 and 19, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said memory error is detected during normal operation in the abstract.

4. As per claims 4 and 20, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said log comprises information about the error type in column 10, lines 19-31.

5. As per claims 6,15,22,31, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said log comprises information about the date and time when said error occurred in the abstract.

6. As per claims 7 and 23, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said log comprises information about the system identification in column 7, lines 62-67.

7. As per claims 8 and 24, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said log is stored in a cyclical manner in column 10, lines 19-38.

8. As per claims 9 and 25, Raynham et al. discloses a central processing unit; a memory system coupled with said central processing unit comprising a plurality of memory module slots for receiving of memory modules, said memory module comprising a random access memory section and a non-volatile memory section; means for detecting an error in said memory system; means for generating a log about said error; and means for storing said log in said non-volatile memory section of a memory module in Figure 2, abstract, in column 10, lines 4-18.

9. As per claims 10 and 26, Raynham et al. fails to explicitly state wherein said means for detecting an error generate an exception within said central processing unit in column 10, lines 4-18.

10. As per claims 11 and 27, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said non-volatile memory is divided in a plurality of sub sections each sub section storing one log in column 10, lines 19-31.

11. As per claims 12 and 28, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said sub sections are written in a cyclical manner in column 10, lines 19-31.

12. As per claims 13 and 29, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said log comprises information about the error type in column 10, lines 19-31.

13. As per claims 16 and 32, Raynham et al. discloses wherein said log comprises information about the system identification in column 7, lines 62-67.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 2,5,14,18,21,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raynham et al. in view of Brisse et al. (WO 99/05599). As per claims 2 and 18, Raynham et al. fails to explicitly state wherein said memory error is detected during a diagnostic test.

Brisse et al. discloses this limitation on pages 8 and 9, 'In another embodiment of the invention, memory errors may be detected during manufacture...This embodiment may be utilized in manufacturing test images and systems undergoing hot room testing.'

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have said memory error is detected during a diagnostic test. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have said memory error is detected during a diagnostic test because memory errors occur during test and are logged to indicate which memory locations have erred.

16. As per claims 5,14,21,30, Raynham et al. fails to explicitly state wherein said log comprises information about the location of the memory module.

Brisse et al. discloses this limitation on page 7, "Once the actual slot number of the interface slot with the error is determined, then the process continues to step 310 in which the actual slot number is stored in the Windows NT<sup>TM</sup> system registry."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have said log comprises information about the location of the memory module. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to have said log comprises information about the location of the memory module because the slot id which indicates the location of the memory module within the system is used to determine the memory module with the error. Brisse et al. discloses this on page 7, "As is known in the art, the system registry is a system database maintained by the operating system to store data such as, for example...information relating to installed hardware and software devices. In preferred embodiments, the driver 2 increments an error count in the system registry. Upon detection of an error, the driver 2 preferably reports such error and count to the well known Windows NT™ System Event Log..."

***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments filed 04/05/2005 have been fully considered and the previous rejection has been withdrawn; however, a new rejection has been made under Raynham et al. as indicated above in the rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2113

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yolanda Wilson  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2113

ylw

  
ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Best Available Copy